DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 052 UD 001 493

The 1963 Dropout Campaign: Summary and Analysis of the Special Summer Program to Combat School Dropout Financed from the President's Emergency Fund.

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Report No-OE-20060; OE-Bull-1964-26
Pub Date 64
Note-36p.
Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402 (GPO FS5.220:20060, $.20)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Curriculum Development, *Dropout Identification, *Dropout Prevention, *Dropout Programs, Flexible Scheduling, Interagency Cooperation, Interagency Coordination, Potential Dropouts, Program Descriptions, Program Effectiveness, Remedial Programs

Reported is the 1963 special summer dropout prevention program financed by the President's emergency fund and by various other national, state, and local agencies and organizations. The document summarizes the dropout campaign and describes briefly the types of programs and methods used to identify and contact dropouts and potential dropouts. Also noted are "promising" trends and activities, including some administrative and curricular adaptations made by schools. Suggested future activities are mentioned. (NH)

ED029052

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

01493 E

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OE-20060
Bulletin 1964, No. 26

The 1963 DROPOUT CAMPAIGN

Summary and Analysis of
The Special Summer Program To Combat School Dropout
Financed From The President's Emergency Fund

UD 001 493

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, *Secretary*

Office of Education
FRANCIS KEPPEL, *Commissioner*

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

School personnel and others interested in reproducing this report may feel free to do so without requesting permission of the Office of Education. Single copies from the Office of Education's limited supply may be obtained upon request. Single copies or quantity orders may be secured from the Superintendent of Documents as indicated at the foot of this page.

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.220 : 20060

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1964

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 20 cents

Foreword

The results of last summer's dropout campaign should bring a new spirit of hope to everyone interested in the education of all young Americans, including those who need special guidance and encouragement. School representatives participating in the program have developed a variety of thoughtful, provocative approaches to the problem, and their efforts deserve our gratitude.

But the end of this campaign is only the start of our real task.

The job of providing an education that is both attractive and valuable to all our youth is never ending. It deserves our urgent attention and our full and constant support.

Francis Keppel

FRANCIS KEPPEL,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Contents

	Page
FOREWORD by Commissioner Francis Keppel	iii
INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND OF THE CAMPAIGN	1
PART I. CAMPAIGN SUMMARY	5
PART II. CONDUCT OF SUMMER CAMPAIGN	7
Types of Programs	7
Techniques of Organizing	10
Methods of Identifying Dropouts and Potential Dropouts	12
Methods of Contacting Dropouts and Potential Dropouts	13
Methods of Encouraging Students To Return	13
Selected Case Studies	14
PART III. FINDINGS FROM CAMPAIGN	17
Reasons for Dropping Out	17
Reasons for Returning	18
Reactions to Summer Campaign	19
PART IV. PROMISING TRENDS AND ACTIVITIES	23
School Adaptations Made	23
Suggested Future Activities	25
APPENDIX: CITY-BY-CITY CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY SUMMARY	27

Introduction

Background of the Campaign

The national summer dropout campaign of 1963 was initiated by President Kennedy. In company with many educators and other Americans, he had long been concerned with the thousands and thousands of youngsters who leave school before finishing their secondary education.

On June 19, at a meeting of over 250 leading educators called to the White House to discuss civil rights, the President emphasized the close relationship between civil rights and educational opportunity, and he made a special plea to the group to make a strong effort that very summer to increase the number of students returning to school in the fall to finish their studies.

The educators present voiced enthusiastic support of the proposal. One school superintendent asked the President if he would lend his assistance to the effort by writing personally to the chairmen of school boards and college boards of trustees across the country to convey to them his sense of urgency about the problem. The President agreed, and early in July he sent more than 7,000 letters asking the board chairmen's assistance in civil rights and in supporting a nationwide effort "to persuade our young people to return to school in September."

At the same time, Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel and several of the school superintendents who were present at the White House meeting attempted to work out specifically what might be done that summer to respond to the President's appeal to reduce dropouts. A group of 28 school superintendents from large cities, their board presidents, several public welfare directors, and juvenile court judges were invited to meet in Washington, D.C., on July 13 with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze; Commissioner Keppel; and Commissioner of Welfare Ellen Winston; and representatives of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, the National Science Foundation, and the National Education Association. Together they discussed possible actions that might be under-

taken on such short notice. The Federal agencies pledged their support.

Of the several ideas presented, two seemed most practical under the circumstances: (1) The mounting of a nationwide publicity campaign, and (2) the use of school counselors and other personnel to identify dropouts and potential dropouts and persuade them to return to school in the fall. Because of the lack of time for preparations it was agreed to focus effort on the largest cities of the Nation, where the largest number of dropouts are concentrated.

The national publicity campaign was generously supported by the mass media across the country. Local radio and television stations and newspapers prepared news and publicity in cooperation with local schools, and the Advertising Council arranged for coast-to-coast distribution of special 1- and 5-minute radio and television appeals by the President.

To help implement local dropout campaigns using school counselors or other personnel, Commissioner Keppel, on July 19, distributed to the superintendents attending the July 13 meeting guidelines to assist in the identification of potential dropouts and suggestions from several Federal agencies as to how Federal programs might contribute to the support of local programs.

To help finance the programs stimulated across the country, President Kennedy on August 1 announced he was making $250,000 available from his emergency funds. Within a few days most of the funds were allocated by telephone to the cities represented at the July 13 meeting whose spokesmen stated they needed and would use their allocation to pay school counselors to work on the program. Additional allocations were made on a first-come, first-served basis, and by mid-August the entire $250,000 had been allocated to 63 communities in 23 States and the District of Columbia.

In addition to the programs supported from the President's emergency fund, other agencies and organizations—National, State, and local—contributed substantially to the total summer campaign. For example, the National Education Association, which for several years has conducted a special "Project School Dropouts," stepped up its efforts and mounted an "Each One Reach One" project in which teachers were encouraged to contact known and potential dropouts and urge their return to school.

Chief among the Federal agencies which sponsored special summer dropout activities were components of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Department of Labor, as follows:

- The Welfare Administration assisted public welfare departments throughout the United States in making special efforts to assure that the children with whom they had contact returned to school in the fall. Complete data on the number of children contacted are not available, but in the 24 States reporting figures some 195,000 children had been visited. In addition, demonstration funds allocated by the Bureau of Family Services paid the expenses of project staffs in eight selected local welfare agencies of five States. Under this program, 2,384 teenagers and their parents were interviewed and counseled on how the public welfare agency might assist them in continuing their educational or vocational preparation.
- The National Institute of Mental Health allocated funds for a demonstration project in Philadelphia to illustrate techniques and procedures useful in dropout prevention and reclamation. During August, 24 counselors representing all but two of the city's senior and technical high schools made 1,567 home visits, talked with 2,229 persons, and explored problems and plans of 1,433 youths.
- The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration as part of the President's summer crash program approved eight special planning grants to help State and local public education and rehabilitation agencies, as well as private nonprofit agencies, plan action programs for school age youths at or near the working age. These special grants were over and above the continuing efforts of the State vocational rehabilitation agencies to provide services to physically, mentally, or emotionally disabled youth of school age which are also preventive in terms of dropouts.
- The U.S. Department of Labor gave priority attention to expansion or initiation of youth programs under the Manpower Development and Training Program. (Three communities reported herein, for example, received substantial grants for dropout programs conducted simultaneously with those receiving allocations from the President's emergency fund.) In addition, the Department distributed films and pamphlets and, through the services of local employment counselors, cooperated actively in the conduct of numerous specific dropout projects.

The summary and analysis which follows relates only to dropout programs launched with grants from the President's emergency fund and conducted through the U.S. Office of Education.

720-630 O—64——2

I. Campaign Summary

Statistically, the results of the Office of Education dropout program of summer 1963 can be summarized as follows:

- **1,375 counselors and other professional workers whose salaries were paid from the special fund participated in the campaign.**
- **59,301 young people identified by these workers as dropouts and potential dropouts were contacted during the campaign.**
- **30,361, or 51.5 percent of the total, returned to school in September.**
- **28,078, or 92.4 percent, of the youths who returned to school as a result of the summer campaign were still enrolled as of November 1.**

But statistics do not tell the complete story. The benefits of this brief period of concerted activity go beyond the number of students who returned to school.

"The sense of unity achieved as the community joined with the schools to help the youth of the City was profoundly impressive and no less beneficial to the adult participants than to the youth who were helped," one superintendent noted. Summary after summary stressed the "public relations" value of the campaign—the heightened spirit of school-community cooperation—as being of incalculable value. For the first time, many reports said, there was community-wide recognition of the dimensions and seriousness of the dropout problem—a necessary preliminary to effective community action.

Equally important, reports frequently stated, school officials were spurred to take a fresh look at customary ways of doing things and to weigh the need for change.

As a result of the program, many schools are now placing special emphasis on helping youngsters who responded to the appeal that they return to the classroom. This activity includes:

- **Improved personal counseling to help students set and achieve realistic goals, to select appropriate courses of study, and to find ways of dealing with their personal problems.**
- **Establishment of special classes, after-school study programs, tutorial help, and other means of giving students the individual attention they need.**

- **Release of certain students from fixed regulations to permit them to take the courses they want and can benefit from or to study part time while they hold part-time jobs, or to make up the course credit or two they need to meet graduation requirements. In one school, for example, a returned student was allowed to give full time to remedial reading and another concentrated entirely on mathematics courses.**
- **Development of improved course offerings and school activities to make the school more interesting and meaningful to individual students.**
- **Greater involvement of the school with the community and with welfare and other public and private agencies to meet social and economic needs that have a bearing on the student's attendance and success in school.**

The increased attention given to matters such as these may be expected to have a profound impact on educational programs of the future and to hasten the development of improved methods of retaining young people in school.

II. Conduct of Summer Campaign

The campaign began and ended within a span of only two months—August 1 to September 30. Some communities conducted activities of various sorts throughout that period. Others limited their actual work with dropouts and potential dropouts to a week or two.

The "crash" nature of the program inevitably produced certain flaws. Participants had to make hasty plans; they could not develop well-rounded orientation programs for school and community workers. Lacking a history of similar projects to use as models, organizers of individual projects had to rely for the most part on trial and error methods. Some school officials reported that they did not have the facilities or personnel to develop new curriculums or programs adapted to the special needs of returnees. Further, the diversity of approaches to the campaign and the lack of systematic reporting procedures made evaluation difficult.

In spite of these flaws, however, all of the cities which participated felt the program had been a remarkable success—in many cases, far beyond original expectations. Furthermore, the "crash" nature of the campaign also had positive effects. Among other things, local initiative and ingenuity were at a premium, and the need for quick decisions focused attention on the necessity of establishing appropriate priorities.

Types of Programs

Principal activities of the dropout campaigns might be classified as promotional, counseling, exploratory, remedial, preventive, and experimental.

Promotional activities consisted of newspaper coverage, radio and television programs and "spot" announcements, public meetings and conferences, and the preparation of leaflets and pamphlets distributed to parents and students or displayed prominently throughout the community.

Primarily directed toward individual dropouts and potential dropouts and their families, the publicity was both national and local—originated and prepared by the schools, mass media, and community organizations. News releases concentrated on the value of education in general as well as on publicizing details of the current campaign locally.

Almost all participating communities reported a heavy emphasis on promotional projects. One community, for example, estimated that $50,000 of air time, newspaper space, and other promotional devices were volunteered for the dropout campaign.

While most campaign directors attributed much of the overall success of their programs to the widespread publicity, they were less specific in its effect on individual dropouts. Analysis of the reports suggests, however, that a major benefit was to get dropouts, potential dropouts, and their families into face-to-face contact with counselors. A report from one community reasoned that the large number of self-referrals at its guidance clinics was a result of the "propaganda broadside" which had "apparently encouraged youngsters to take a second look at their decision to quit school."

Counseling activities were generally identified as the heart of the dropout campaign. Most reports pointed out that student-counselor contacts were the single most important factor in persuading youths to return to school in the fall. During the counseling sessions, students and counselors together worked out suitable program schedules for the returnees and, when necessary, discussed possible sources of outside help for pressing economic, social, and welfare needs.

Counselors appreciated the opportunity to work with individual students without the normal diversions of teaching and administrative duties. Many counselors noted that this freedom to concentrate their efforts significantly improved their ability to help young people develop worthwhile goals and comprehend the importance of education for success in their future plans.

Further, campaign directors almost unanimously declared that the person-to-person counseling contacts constituted an invaluable public relations benefit.

Exploratory surveys of three basic types carried out during the course of the summer campaign were reported by various communities: (a) Localized studies focused on the dimensions of the dropout problem, age and grade groupings of dropouts, the segment of school term during which the dropout occurred, and characteristics of the typical dropout as noted from cumulative records. (b) Detailed information

from records and followup studies about why students drop out of school. (c) Preregistration information as to whether students who had been enrolled during the previous June were planning to return for the fall term.

The first two of these types of surveys were considered essential in any long-range planning for effective dropout programs. The third focused on identification of individual students who needed immediate attention during the summer campaign so that there would be no break in their school career.

One important overall finding from these surveys was the frequent inadequacy of school records and reporting procedures. Many schools had no record of reasons for students having dropped out. Others had been classifying all school leavers—including transfers to other schools—as dropouts. This not only distorted the dropout picture but made followup extremely difficult and hampered the school in estimating needs for suitable preventive and remedial measures.

Remedial action: The problem of reclaiming dropouts after they returned to class was approached in a number of ways. Some schools tried to fit returnees into the same old situation. Others took care to find appropriate places in existing programs, evening classes, or out-of-school training programs. Many helped individual students find part-time jobs and adapted school schedules appropriately.

Still others—and this includes the majority of participating schools—modified their curriculums or programming. A number of these adaptations are identified in a separate section of this report.

Many schools noted that time limitations of the summer crash campaign were such that they were unable to follow through on remedial plans to the extent they would have desired. By and large, needs identified during the summer campaign served as a distinct eye opener for most schools.

Preventive activities stressed early identification of potential dropouts and prompt attention to their individual needs. Many schools drew up criteria for the identification of potential dropouts, sometimes from the results of the exploratory surveys made during the summer and sometimes from statewide and national studies conducted during recent years. Most school reports recommended the strengthening of guidance services and outlined ways school programs, activities of social and welfare agencies, and cooperation of community leaders might be harnessed to deal with the dropout problem.

Some schools adopted *experimental* projects to combat a single phase of the dropout problem or to concentrate on a special type of dropout reclamation or prevention activity.

Los Angeles, for example, instituted a program to work with 100 "hard core" dropouts. The entire community—school, welfare agencies, employers, parents—has been mobilized to deal with the multiple needs of the participating youths. The program focuses on making the youths independent and self-sustaining and is continuing throughout the school year with local funds.

Numerous communities conducted prevention programs involving work-study activities. Set up as pilot projects, these had the purpose of providing intensive help to limited numbers of well-screened youth who had previously rejected or been turned out of the "normal" academic situation.

Experimental programs are not yet widespread, primarily due to the fiscal limitations of most schools. However, many reports of the summer campaign identified projects which should be of value on a long-term basis in resolving separate facets of the dropout problem.

Techniques of Organizing

There was general agreement that the complexity of the dropout problem demands a well-coordinated attack on many fronts. Schools alone cannot do the job. Help must be enlisted from all appropriate sectors—welfare organizations, press, employment services, labor, civic, business, and other community groups—to cope with the many factors that bear on ability and desire to attend school.

On the national front, for example, the Welfare Administration, Bureau of Family Services, Children's Bureau, National Institute of Mental Health, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Office of Education (all components of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), and the U.S. Department of Labor collectively played an important part in making the overall program successful beyond original expectations.

Communities reporting the most dramatic results were those in which school officials already knew the scope of their dropout problem and were ready to work with other agencies and groups toward effective solutions.

Typically, superintendents of schools invited community leaders to join in planning an integrated, complementary attack on the local dropout problem. In one community, for instance, cooperating units consisted of 13 radio stations, 5 television stations, 10 neighborhood newspapers, 5 groups of labor representatives, and 22 other agencies,

social and welfare organizations, employment services, and other major community groups.

Then, during and after a series of conferences, participants mounted their own subcampaigns. Characteristically:

- Mass media representatives were responsible for publicity and continuing coverage of events.
- School administrators were responsible for adapting curriculums and scheduling classes to meet the needs of returnees and for enlisting the support of the school staff to insure a suitable climate for learning.
- Counselors were responsible for identifying dropouts and potential dropouts, contacting them, and giving them special guidance in face-to-face meetings in the student's home or at school. In some cases referrals were made to such additional sources of training and guidance as State Employment agencies or Manpower Development officials, private trade and technical schools, vocational post-graduate schools, colleges, probation officers, welfare agencies, rehabilitation services, and the like.
- Employment services and employers cooperated in placing students in appropriate full-time or part-time jobs.
- Community groups participated in a variety of ways to encourage young people to return to school and to enable them to do so. Some groups provided volunteer tutoring services while others sponsored scholarship programs or contributed in other tangible ways, as well as giving enthusiastic moral support to the program.
- Public welfare agencies, which conducted their own national campaign with Federal grants available through the Welfare Administration, were especially well-organized to cooperate in local back-to-school drives.

Project directors set up channels for close working relationships. Evaluation meetings were held to gauge the efficacy of programs and to suggest ways of shoring up. Special effort was made to keep the community fully informed of all activities.

As a result of the summer campaign, most of the participating communities now have a firm basis for cooperating more efficiently in the future. The experience has stimulated a better understanding of the ways and means by which schools and communities can work together on behalf of youth—more particularly, disadvantaged youth.

Many communities reported that the public relations value of the campaign was itself well worth the total time, effort, and expense involved—an extra bonus to the restoration of thousands of youth to the classroom.

720-630 O—64——3

Methods of Identifying Dropouts and Potential Dropouts

Of the *actual dropouts* contacted during the campaign, most were attritions of the 1962–63 academic year or summer 1963 dropouts. A few schools, primarily those with well-developed evening or adult programs as well as comprehensive day school facilities, delved into records of the past five years for names of dropouts.

Principal sources of information were school attendance records and withdrawal cards, classroom teachers' first-day records, employment permit requests, and such individual sources as teachers, counselors, parents, employers, welfare workers, probation officers, and dropouts themselves.

Characteristics of dropouts as reported in certain previous studies of the problem gave some schools fairly reliable clues to follow in identifying *potential dropouts.* Other schools developed their own criteria. And still others used the following summary provided by the Office of Education:

- **Primary factors: Consistent failure to achieve in regular school work. Age sixteen years or older (35 percent drop out at age 16, 27 percent at age 17). Low reading ability. Grade level placement two or more years below average for age. Retained in grade at least once in the elementary school. Irregular attendance and frequent tardiness. Frequent changes of schools. Refusal to participate in extracurricular activities. Performance consistently below potential. Parents usually have less than an 8th grade education, are in low-income groups—usually in a trade or labor occupation. Boys are more likely than girls to become dropouts.**
- **Related factors: Active antagonism to teachers and principals. Marked disinterest in school and a feeling of "not belonging." Not accepted by the school staff. Unhappy family situation. Marked differences from schoolmates, such as in interests, social level, physique, national origin, dress, or personality development. Inability to afford the normal expenditures of schoolmates. Inability to compete with brothers and sisters. Serious physical or emotional handicaps. Discipline cases. Record of delinquency. Activities centered outside school. Male car owners. Often in difficulty with community agencies and the law. An air of purposelessness and no personal goals for achievement. Negative attitude of parents toward graduation.**

The usual method of identifying potential dropouts consisted of reviewing cumulative and anecdotal records and applying criteria such as those listed above. In some cases, classroom teachers were asked to identify students known to them to be potential dropouts.

Some schools worked with all dropouts and with all students identified as potential dropouts. Others limited their efforts to the more

"desirable" students or those whom they believed to have the best chance of profiting scholastically in the local public day school with appropriate individual attention.

It was typical of this latter approach that considerable research went into the screening process. Each student—dropout and potential dropout—was evaluated on the basis of information from test scores of his mental ability, academic achievement, interests and aptitudes, attendance record, discipline record, age, number of credits earned at the junior or senior high school level and, if a dropout, his reasons for having left school. In addition, conferences were held with junior and senior high school principals, deans, and guidance directors to estimate the advisability of the individual's return and to determine the conditions under which he might do so.

Methods of Contacting Dropouts and Potential Dropouts

Methods of establishing contact with students and their parents or guardians included telephone conferences, letters encouraging students to return, mass media announcements, home visits and conferences, and interviews in the counselor's office.

Typical reports stressed the importance of individual counseling conferences. Most counselors felt these interviews were more successful when conducted in the student's home, where the whole family could participate freely, rather than in an office.

The following materials were among those most often provided to counselors: A list of students to contact, an information form for dropout contacts, a card with which dropouts returning to school could make an appointment with the school's counseling coordinator, an interviewing form, and booklets and materials that would encourage dropouts to continue their educational experiences. Interviewers also studied the school records of dropouts prior to personal visits.

Methods of Encouraging Students To Return

Reports of the program repeatedly made the point that each dropout is unique. In most cases, moreover, his decision to leave school or to return is not a result of an idle whim. Typically, he has been overcome by an array of pressing problems—personal, economic, or social, as well as scholastic—which must be remedied before he reenrolls in school.

Alleviation of specific conditions and encouragement to return therefore had to come from a number of sources.

Most communities which participated in the summer campaign found that personal economics comprised a major factor in the dropout problem. Students either needed to work, felt they needed to work, or had little confidence in what the school was doing to prepare them vocationally.

Frequently in these cases school-community cooperation through work-experience programs, part-time jobs, and the establishment of special classroom schedules to permit outside employment became the decisive factor in the return of a dropout.

Special classes for remedial work, particularly in reading and mathematics, helped many young people regain confidence in their ability to complete regular graduation requirements. In one community, the assistance of volunteer tutors (all college graduates) provided not only remedial help—leading to better school performance of several dozen academically retarded students—but also acted as a powerful morale booster.

The feeling that somebody "cares" was found to be of overwhelming importance for most of the young people involved in the summer campaign.

In some cases, introduction to the activities of such organizations as the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., or Scouts was found to be enough to satisfy a student's immediate social needs. Youth centers and expanded activities in the schools provided the answer for many others.

The ability of schools to meet the individual needs of students was found, as might be expected, to be the chief determinant in whether most dropouts will return to school and remain there until graduation. (Some promising adaptions and innovations made or suggested as a result of the summer campaign are identified in a separate part of this report.)

Selected Case Studies

The four cases described below illustrate approaches to solving the problems of individual dropouts. Although not typical of the American school population in general, they are nonetheless representative of a sizeable segment of the local dropout picture in many communities.

Case 1

Charles C. left school immediately after reaching the age limit for compulsory attendance. He conceded that he was penalizing himself by dropping out but said he felt compelled to contribute to the support of his mother and several half-brothers and half-sisters who were periodically abandoned by his step father. Moreover, he said, the school in his district was oriented primarily toward college preparatory programs and offered no courses that would train him to hold a job.

After consultation with the boy, a school counselor in cooperation with an all-community dropout committee considered his problems and set out to deal with them one at a time.

A suitable program consisting of both job-oriented courses and English and mathematics classes were established at a school in a nearby neighborhood, and transfer arrangements were made. A job for evenings and weekends was found so that Charles might contribute to the support of his family. Funds made available by a local businessman provided a small loan to take care of his immediate financial needs for lunch and bus fare until his first pay check was due. The Mutual Help Agency supplied him with needed clothing. The school counselor provided him with books.

Case 2

Marvin B. was another youngster who said he felt compelled to drop out of school and take a job, in this case because his parents were in financial straits. One day late in the summer his foreman, who had taken an interest in the boy, got into a discussion with him about the advantages of continuing his education. By chance, when Marvin got home that evening he learned that a high school counselor had telephoned to set up a meeting to discuss the possibility of his return to school. Stirred by this show of interest, Marvin talked with the pastor of his church and received similar advice. On the basis of conversations with these three persons and the encouragement of his parents, Marvin decided that he could "afford" to return to school after all.

Case 3

Helen R., a girl in a large city, said she had dropped out of school because she could not take the school courses she wanted and did not get along with the teachers to whom she was assigned. What was more important, she felt socially rejected because she had a hairlip and several facial scars. Her health was bad; the effort of climbing the stairs of the school building made her legs and neck swell.

The school alone could not take care of all these problems. But as a result of the sympathetic attention of a counselor working in the summer dropout campaign, sufficient solutions were found to reclaim her for the school.

A community agency helped to obtain plastic surgery for her face and to provide other medical care. The attention she received diminished her fears of social rejection. For her school problems, a transfer to a vocational

institute located in an elevator-equipped building served the twofold purpose of offering the career training she wanted and eliminating the necessity of climbing stairs. At last report, she was doing fine in her new situation.

Case 4

Harry J., an engaging Indian lad in his middle teens, could neither read nor write. His curiosity aroused by the campaign publicity, Harry asked his mother to approach school authorities, and shortly thereafter he was enrolled in one of the junior high schools. He dropped out almost immediately, however, subsequently explaining that he could not endure school regulations requiring him to wear short pants during physical education class and take community showers.

A school counselor following up his case suggested that the youngster enroll in the adult education program. Harry was willing but said he could not afford the $2 enrollment fee and the additional $4 necessary for books and supplies. The counselor had no trouble arranging for one of the local civic clubs to meet these costs, and Harry was soon enrolled in remedial English classes.

III. Findings From Campaign

As anticipated from previous studies of school dropouts, communities participating in the summer 1963 campaign generally found that dropouts occur most frequently in the 10th and 11th grades, when youths are 16 and 17 years old. The highest attrition period is the summer closest to the time the student has reached the age limit his State requires for compulsory school attendance.

Reasons for Dropping Out

Major reasons students dropped out of school, according to school officials and individual dropouts, were as follows (composite report):

- **Disinterest in school, compounded from such matters as discouragement because of failing grades; other adverse school experience, including rejection by fellow students or the school staff; and dissatisfaction with the school program, particularly because of the absence of specific vocational training desired by the student.**
- **Home responsibilities, including a real need to work to help support the family or to stay at home and care for younger brothers and sisters or ailing parents. In a low economic area in one community, for example, a dropout peak was reached in the age group too old to qualify for welfare assistance.**
- **Unfavorable parental attitude, including lack of feeling for the importance of school, general lack of concern for the child, inability to cope with or influence the child's behavior, desire for financial assistance from the child or to train child in father's business, and support of child's desire to leave school and be "independent." As anticipated from previous studies, parents of most dropouts were dropouts themselves.**
- **Peer influence, sometimes translated by the student as economic pressure—the compulsion to earn money in order to afford to dress as well as classmates, have equivalent spending money, and the like. Teenage boys, especially, were found to have dropped out of school to buy or maintain a car. In some cases, peer influence had resulted in general delinquent behavior and trouble with school authorities.**

- **Unhappy home situations coupled with the desire to be independent of parental ties led many youngsters to take jobs, enter the military service, or get married rather than continue to live at home and attend school.**

Reasons for Returning

A new feeling for the *value of education* was identified as an underlying factor in the decision of most returnees to go back to the classroom. Many young people said they had found that "You really need an education." Some had come to think of a high school education as "insurance for the future."

Reports repeatedly stressed that the *personal interest* shown them by school staff members and the community during the summer influenced the return of many dropouts and deterred many potential dropouts from their plans to leave school. The students themselves frequently acknowledged this fact in such comments as, "I didn't know anybody cared about me."

Counselors noted that many young people interviewed "seemed anxious to return to school but had been fearful or reluctant to take the first step on their own." Many dropouts said they had been waiting for a counselor to call.

Typically, when students decided that someone had genuine interest in them and that the attention they were receiving was directed at their personal, individual needs, they forgot their resentment over past school experiences and welcomed the opportunity to continue their education.

Their *experience as dropouts* influenced many young people to ask for another chance. Predictably, many who had left school to work had been unable to find jobs and now were "tired of sitting around." One 16-year-old girl phrased her experience this way: "I've been trying to find a job for the last four months—babysitting, clerking, anything. I know now that you really need that piece of paper—the diploma."

A mother in another participating community wrote the following about her son: "He wishes to return to high school and graduate because he has learned that there is nothing he can do without an education. He has tried to get a job and failed. He has tried to enlist in the service, but was unable to pass the test. He has learned now that the school doesn't need him, but that he needs the school and what it has to offer."

Also predictably, most of the dropouts who had found employment were working at jobs which brought in an unsatisfactory income and held no promise for the future. When they found, as they said, that "You can't get anywhere without a high school diploma," they returned to school.

Parental pressure was instrumental in returning other dropouts and potential dropouts to school. Reports from many participating schools said that the campaign publicity influenced at least some parents to encourage their children to return to the classroom.

Alleviation of pressing needs through the *services of community agencies* helped many students who had left school because of conditions beyond their control. Typical of this assistance was welfare aid for the destitute, part-time employment, and provision of babysitting services to eliminate the need for school-age youths to stay at home to care for younger members of the family. Medical care helped a number of youths. Scholarships provided by the American Legion assisted several young people in one city to return to full-time academic schedules.

School adaptations made to suit the requirements of individual students returned many young people to the classroom. Representative examples are given in a separate part of this report.

Reactions to Summer Campaign

In the majority of the areas in which dropout campaigns were conducted last summer, there was "vast, eager, spontaneous participation," to use the terminology of one school superintendent. Several participants who had begun the program with only lukewarm feelings experienced a change of heart and expressed strong hopes for the future as a result of these activities.

Parental reactions: All participating communities found parental reaction predominantly favorable. Most parents appreciated the special interest shown their children and expressed gratitude for the opportunity of person-to-person contact with counselors and other school personnel. "It's wonderful that the schools would actually send somebody out to talk to my boy," was a typical comment.

Only a few contacts revealed lack of parental interest in the education of the dropout. This is particularly significant in view of the common assumption that dropouts usually come from homes where education is not valued.

"Contrary to popular belief, many parents of the dropouts and the potential dropouts are in favor of their children returning to school," a typical report read. Another report stated that "parents seemed pleased that the school was interested" and that they had "someone to back them up" in trying to get the student back to class.

A parent in a culturally deprived area said this of a special evening guidance clinic: "It's good to see the lights in your school. The kids and we parents need help all of the time."

Counselor reactions: "Our counselors are different people now," one superintendent said. The following statements from campaign summaries reveal what counselors gained as a result of their summer experience with dropouts:

- **"Initially the counselors assigned to the dropout project merely exhibited a willingness to be involved in the arduous task of counseling dropouts to return to school. As the program progressed there was a steady mounting enthusiasm for their work. Many expressed personal satisfaction in helping an individual youngster decide to reenroll in September. Great satisfaction was derived in having the opportunity to do real counseling with students and parents. . . . Many of the participants expressed surprise at the enthusiasm with which they were greeted by both students and parents."**
- **"Our field counselors gained new insight in working intensively with these young people. Going into the community and discovering the 'hidden poverty' had impact on even the veteran teacher and counselor of the school. A new awareness and unique sensitivity to the problems these young people face is having its effect on the majority of the school staff as they follow the progress of this program."**
- **"The entire program was an excellent opportunity for doing some good counseling. How much more effective it would be to be able to do this before the student drops out!"**
- **"Our counselors were unanimous in their feeling that it provided them with an opportunity to do an intensified type of individual counseling which is not possible during the regular school year."**
- **"This is the most rewarding experience in education that I have had in the fourteen years I've been in the business!"**
- **"Home visits served as good counselor training. All agreed they felt the home contacts and the experience will make them more understanding of the problems connected with the homes of the dropouts. We also felt that it was good public relations for the guidance department and the school."**

Teacher and administrator reactions: Administrators were grateful for the unexpected funds especially earmarked for this purpose. "We couldn't have financed the project from local sources," one said. Another commented, "There is so much we would like to do for the young

people that we cannot because of budgetary limitations and crowded school buildings."

The demonstrated national interest "and a profound concern on the part of the total community for the welfare of its youth have created a climate for change that has already paid great dividends," still another administrator commented.

There were, however, isolated examples of negative reactions of teachers and other school personnel. A report from a large city declared that many of the dropouts and potential dropouts "are not very desirable as students, are not sincere, do not make a good impression as students, and are generally indecisive."

The same report went on to add that, "We must at least try because they will be even less desirable as citizens if something is not done to improve them."

IV. Promising Trends and Activities

"Dropouts are not beyond the reach of the school," wrote the superintendent of schools from one large city in his campaign summary. "The converse seems true, too," he continued, "that school is not sufficient for all youth."

Or, in the words of another campaign participant, "Doors were opened, and our concern now is to provide a school program which will keep in school those who did return."

School Adaptations Made

In planning the summer program it was recognized from the start that most dropouts leave school, among other things, because the school program does not seem to meet their needs. A number of superintendents commented that the summer program would be of relatively little value unless it served to awaken the community to the need to make changes in school programs so that students would see their way to continuing their education until graduation.

Although the main hope was for long-term changes in educational programs, many communities were able to make adjustments immediately in order to take care of many students returning to school as a result of the campaign. Typical of the adjustments were:

- *Adjustments in educational offerings.* A high percentage of schools reported a need for greater strength and diversification in vocational courses of their curriculums. Specifically mentioned most frequently were distributive education, office occupations, and shop courses. Correspondingly, students themselves said they wanted technical and skill courses in fields such as electronics and auto mechanics designed to lead to immediate job placement. Many schools found work-study programs outstandingly successful in motivating students who said they would otherwise be dropouts.
- *Increased remedial help.* Since most dropouts and potential dropouts are academically retarded in reading or other "solid" subject matter fields, many schools scheduled remedial classes to meet their special needs.

Others provided afterhours, Saturday, and summer tutorial or study-help sessions. Aimed at improving the academic skills of individual students, some of the most successful of these programs were staffed by volunteer college graduates from the community, local college students, and talented upper-level high school students, as well as by teachers and other qualified school personnel.

- *Adjustments in time schedules.* Perhaps the most frequent of all school adaptations involved provision for part-time scheduling to permit outside employment. Similar arrangements for abbreviated schedules encouraged a number of young mothers as well as employed youths to return to school part-time to follow diploma programs.

- *Waiving of requirements.* Some schools adopted ungraded programs at the high school level so that potential dropouts might elect only the courses they wanted rather than the full course leading to graduation. For example, some students were permitted to carry only shop programs or to concentrate specifically on remedial English and mathematics while pursuing a work-study program. Other schools experimented with trial promotions of students who lacked a single course or two so as to permit them to be with other students of their own age, size, or maturity level. Still others reviewed their policy of accepting transfer credits, taking a more lenient attitude toward study completed in evening or other classes conducted outside the public school system or training programs not under the auspices of the local school.

- *Improved counseling services.* Most campaign participants stressed that improved guidance procedures in the schools could be of profound benefit to the students—especially to dropouts and potential dropouts. Counselors were urged to pay more attention to individual needs of students in helping with subject selection and in making assignments to the most competent and sympathetic teachers. Further, the strengthening of counseling services to permit early identification of potential dropouts was frequently recommended as necessary for instituting prompt and effective preventive and remedial measures.

Although the overwhelming majority of schools reported at least some of the foregoing adaptations as already made or presently contemplated, a certain number of reports questioned the value of reinstating dropouts. The reasoning was that the "welfare of the school as an institution as well as the welfare of students who are achieving well in school" might be harmed by the inauguration of special programs benefiting youngsters who did not appear truly interested in school.

However, even those who appeared most doubtful about reenrolling actual dropouts typically saw value in extending school counseling services to help youths select meaningful educational programs outside of regular school hours in summer school, evening school, adult day high school, and Saturday morning classes. Several reports re-

commended that youths be helped in programs leading toward high school equivalency certificates rather than graduation diplomas or be placed in appropriate training situations other than those of the local public school.

Suggested Future Activities

Time and again the reports of the campaign stressed the need for early identification of potential dropouts and for year-round preventive measures. As one campaign director noted, "It is important to accept the fact that dropouts, underachievers, and others who have frustrating experiences in school did not get that way overnight and are not likely to become markedly different overnight."

Activities suggested for the future therefore emphasized two major areas of effort—conduct of an annual summer campaign and continuing emphasis on preventive measures.

All reports urged the repetition of special dropout programs each summer. Most pleaded the allocation of Federal funds for this purpose.

A majority of those who engaged in the campaign suggested that procedure improvements be made in future years. They foresaw the possibility of broadening the scope of the campaign and predicted results even more dramatic than those of the 1963 "crash" program.

Communities which had limited their work with dropouts to a period of one or two weeks in August almost without exception stressed the need for more time in the conduct of the dropout program. One report, for example, stated that counselors should be available for five weeks before the start of school. A period of this length, it was pointed out, would allow time to get cumulative records transferred to the guidance center, to schedule testing sessions when necessary, and to permit unhurried counseling of students before setting up appropriate individualized school programs.

Some reports mentioned the need for better communications. It was particularly important, they said, that individual dropouts and potential dropouts be notified of the name, telephone number, and appointment hours of a school counselor who might be called upon during the summer for educational and other guidance.

Other reports recommended unified, districtwide policy decisions for identifying and screening potential dropouts. Most reports proposed ways in which preventive help might be provided as soon as

evidence of a potential dropout problem became noticeable, preferably in the elementary school. School administrators in some communities cited plans to establish closer working relationships between counselors at the various grade levels to facilitate the introduction of more effective remedial programs. Some suggested that all junior and senior high school counselors be responsible for drawing up lists of potential dropouts for referral to summer programs.

Many school officials said they plan pilot projects, generally of a work-study nature, to encourage the retention or return of vocationally-oriented youngsters. Others outlined plans to work with the community on economic and welfare projects, such as part-time jobs, scholarship help, and provision of lunches and clothing where necessary. In line with local findings as to the need for improving the community's awareness of its obligations for the education of its youth, some schools plan to stress closer involvement of parents, businessmen, employment and welfare agencies, and other community groups with activities of the school.

Many participating schools reported that they had been handicapped in the 1963 summer program by insufficient knowledge of their local dropout situation. They recommended further study to determine the causes and scope of the problem and careful followup of all returned dropouts and potential dropouts.

Typically, reports told of plans to study curriculums in terms of student needs. Most campaign participants foresaw a sizeable expansion in vocational and skill courses, and especially in work-study programs. Some predicted that sweeping changes will be necessary to make sure that suitable opportunities are in fact provided for all youth.

"A large part of the answer to the dropout problem," observed the report from one community, "is 100 percent dedication by schools to make school experiences meaningful to the individual child."

Appendix

City-by-City Campaign Activity Summary

(*NOTE: The following highlights of campaign activities in the 63 participating communities are not comparable in all respects due to diversity in approaches and reporting procedures.*)

Akron, Ohio: Emphasis on guidance. Extensive promotions. Plans work-study project for dropout prevention. Contacted 611 dropouts and potential dropouts, registered 537 for classes.

Annapolis, Md.: Emphasis on promotions and preregistration survey. Contacted 334 dropouts and potential dropouts; reenrolled 185 of the most academically promising youths.

Atlanta, Ga.: One school system had comprehensive program to reclaim dropouts; included numerous school adjustments and wide community support. Contacted 1,733 youths, registered 401 for regular day school. Other school system conducted survey of dropout scope as preliminary to comprehensive attack on problem.

Baldwin, N.Y.: Preregistration survey; emphasis on individual counseling; numerous school adaptations. Contacted 315 youths, registered 305 in classes.

Baltimore, Md.: Comprehensive school-community program; counseling emphasis; extensive school adaptations. Contacted 3,080 youths, registered 1,396 in day school programs.

Belleville, N.J.: Emphasis on counseling; several community surveys initiated for dropout preventive use. Contacted 105 youths, registered 43 in classes.

Boston, Mass.: Establishment of guidance clinics; cooperation with employment agencies. Remedial and tutorial programs developed and study under way for wider curriculum changes. Contacted 598 youths, registered 403 in classes.

Bound Brook, N.J.: Survey showed no summer dropouts, so no campaign made. Contacted 13 potential dropouts, registered all 13 in regular day school classes.

Bridgeton, N.J.: No details of campaign. Contacted 66 youths, registered 12 in classes.

Buffalo, N.Y.: Campaign conducted as supplement to many continuing programs for dropout prevention and reclamation. Extensive counseling; refining of followup procedures. Contacted 437 youths, registered 382 in classes.

Champaign, Ill.: No details of campaign. Contacted 75 youths, registered 37 in classes.

Chenango, N.Y.: Survey of dropout situation; contact of last three years' dropouts to encourage return to school. Contacted 35 youths, registered 28 in classes.

Chicago, Ill.: Campaign conducted as continuation of summer guidance clinics inaugurated in 1962; involved personal counseling, pre-registration survey, and school orientation. Contacted 8,884 youths, registered 1,929 in classes.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Promotional emphasis. Survey of dropouts among school leavers. Experimental programs for counseling and financial aid. Contacted 1,164 youths, registered 423 in classes.

Cleveland, Ohio: Extensive promotions program. School emphasis on guidance to reclaim and prevent dropouts. Area has comprehensive school system capable of meeting wide range of needs as supplement to public school programs. Contacted 1,600 youths, registered 655 in classes.

Danville, Ill.: Dropout study, pre-registration survey, and screening of dropouts and potential dropouts to reclaim or retain most able. Contacted 397 youths, registered 318 in classes.

Dayton, Ohio: Four schools participated, each using different approaches, to reclaim dropouts of last academic year. Best success reported in school which had comprehensive school-community approach. Many community activities begun as result of campaign. Contacted 161 dropouts, registered 114 in classes.

Denver, Colo.: Survey of dropout situation, contact with actual and potential dropouts. Counseling services will be expanded. Contacted 1,802 youths, registered 394 in regular day classes.

Detroit, Mich.: Extensive promotions campaign. Counselors screened dropouts of summer and previous academic year and encouraged most able to return; provided personal and employment guidance to others. Contacted 1,888 youths, registered 534 in school classes.

Dover, N.J.: Identification of actual and potential dropouts, extensive counseling efforts to encourage return of all youths. Appropriate curricular and scheduling adaptations to meet immediate and long-range needs of students. Contacted 90 youths, registered 86 in classes.

Elizabeth, N.J.: Efforts at senior high school level were to reclaim actual dropouts, at junior high school level to prevent dropouts. School adaptations to benefit returnees. Contacted 220 youths, registered 44 returnees.

Flemington, N.J.: Survey of dropout situation of five years, including reasons for leaving, as guide in adapting school programs to meet student needs. Counseling of actual dropouts to encourage return. Plans increased guidance services. Contacted 104 youths, registered 56 in classes.

Flint, Mich.: Study of dropout situation in last year's enrollment. Extensive school adaptations in recent years to meet needs of students has resulted in extremely high holding power of school. Excellent out-of-school educational program meets special needs; credits transferrable for meeting high school graduation requirements. Contacted 216 youths, registered 189 in classes.

Fredericksburg, Va.: Survey of school leavers of past three years to determine scope of dropout problem. Counseling of dropouts to encourage return; arrangements for loans for needy returnees. Contacted 440 youths, registered 138 in classes.

Garden City, Mich.: Extensive promotions aimed at getting dropouts to come to school for counseling. Student attitude and readiness for school were stressed at conferences. School was selective in accepting returnees. Contacted 124 youths, registered 38 in school classes.

Kansas City, Mo.: Extensive promotional activities. Home-school coordinators contacted known dropouts and encouraged their visit to school for counseling. Suggestions made for curriculum and scheduling adaptations to benefit returnees and prevent future dropouts. Attention paid to school "misfits" and the relation of this problem to the common good. Contacted 3,302 youths, registered 519 in classes.

LaGrange, Ga.: Study of actual dropout situation, identification of potential dropouts; contacts to encourage return. Schools added Special Education courses and improved vocational offerings and guidance procedures. Four elementary schools are conducting a comprehensive school-community pilot project for dropout prevention and followup study. Contacted 383 youths, registered 137 for classes.

Langhorne, Pa.: Study of dropout situation; contact with actual and potential dropouts to encourage return. Guidance activities to improve placement of returnees. School plans several curriculum revisions, possible change in graduation requirements. Contacted 37 youths, registered 10 in classes.

Lansing, Mich.: Counseling emphasis on recent dropouts and potential dropouts. Study of possible school adaptations for dropout prevention includes many promising programs. Contacted 178 youths, registered 99 for classes.

Laramie, Wyo.: Contact of actual and potential dropouts; emphasis on individual programming for returnees. School plans curriculum adaptations and closer work with community agencies. Contacted 106 youths, registered 72 in classes.

Lima, Ohio: Extensive promotions campaign; tutoring program for potential dropouts; study of dropout causes; close community cooperation. Contacted 49 youths, registered 48 in classes.

Los Angeles, Calif.: Pilot project to reclaim 100 "hard core" dropouts; involves comprehensive school adaptations, close school-community cooperation.

Madison, N.J.: Study of dropout situation, followup of dropouts of past four years. Contact with dropouts to encourage return. Recommendations for increasing guidance services and establishment of vocational school. Contacted 26 youths, registered 10 in classes.

Memphis, Tenn.: Contact with dropouts to encourage return to some formal school activity. Results reported include reclaiming several dropouts to public day schools and a sharp increase in night school enrollments. Contacted 892 youths, registered 492 in classes.

Miami, Fla.: Campaign conducted as part of a larger project to identify, contact, and counsel potential and recent dropouts. Extensive promotions. Comprehensive guidance and followup. Plans to evaluate and improve curriculum, instruction, and guidance services. Emphasis on better utilization of community resources. A number of experimental groupings and kinds of course offerings are being initiated in participating schools. Contacted 6,183 youths, registered 4, 451 in classes.

Milwaukee, Wis.: No details of campaign. Contacted 277 youths, registered 95 in classes.

Minneapolis, Minn.: Comprehensive school-community program, with well-developed promotions activities. Study to identify scope of dropout problem. Counselors contacted some dropouts and other dropouts on own initiative came to school for counseling; emphasis placed on appropriate programming rather than on actual counseling. Schools reportedly have budget problems, so were not able to make special provisions for returnees other than placing them in meaningful course and study opportunities. Much consideration as to whether schools could and should accept all returnees in light of needs of successful student population. Contacted 938 youths, registered 508 in classes.

Newark, N.J.: Counselors identified dropouts, interviewed and provided guidance as necessary to dropouts and their families—including referrals to welfare and employment agencies; followed-up on dropout contacts. School adaptations to accommodate needs of returnees. In-school promotions elicited full support and enthusiasm of staff. Closer school-community activities initiated, plans speeded on work-study program, guidance efforts strengthened. Contacted 725 youths, registered 492 in classes.

New Brunswick, N.J.: Summary of dropout situation, contact to encourage return of dropouts; followup planned. Suggestions for pilot projects for remedial reading course in summer for potential dropouts and for psychiatric assistance for special cases. Contacted 170 youths, enrolled 102 in classes.

New Orleans, La.: Counseling emphasis in contacts with recent and summer dropouts as identified locally in State-wide study; study of dropout reasons. Plans for closer work with community groups and agencies and for in-depth study of dropout problem with emphasis on identification, prevention, and reclamation of dropouts. Curricular changes likely after further study. Contacted 1,077 youths, reenrolled 436 in classes.

New York, N.Y.: September evening guidance and testing centers provided educational and vocafional counseling for dropouts up to age 20 as supplement to August counseling program partially financed from other sources. Suggestion for pilot project of dropout followup. Total of 3,524 youths contacted during 2-month program, 2,423 registered for classes.

Norwalk, Conn.: Counseling for extensive list of recent and potential summer dropouts. Need found for curricular changes and other fundamentals of dropout prevention. Contacted 73 youths, registered 55 in classes.

Orange, N.J.: Identification of potential dropouts, study of dropout reasons. Counseling of youths; class scheduling adaptations. Number of curriculum changes planned. Strong guidance department plans continued efforts for early identification and assistance of potential dropouts with community support. Contacted 108 youths, registered 69 in classes.

Parsippany, N.J.: Encouragement of recent and former dropouts to return to school. Contacted 31 youths, registered 11 in classes.

Pawtucket, R.I.: Study of dropout situation; counseling of actual and potential dropouts. Curriculum adjustments. Contacted 154 youths, registered 42 in classes.

Pennsville, N.J.: Study of dropout situation; contact with recent dropouts to encourage return to school. Contacted 197 youths, registered 10 in classes.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Extensive promotions program. Identification and intensive counseling of potential dropouts; study of reasons for dropout. Scheduling changes, work-study programs, and a number of individual adjustments made for the benefit of returnees. Contacted 1,368 youths, registered 1,188 in classes.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: Using 1961–62 study of dropouts, a large staff of counselors identified and studied methods of attacking local dropout problem. Contacted and counseled individual youths, utilized community resources. Extensive promotions campaign. Contacted 1,825 youths, registered 794 in classes.

Point Pleasant, N.J.: Compilation of list of actual dropouts; contact and counseling. Placement of some youths in new vocational school. Plans to continue special guidance services, open remedial reading classes, and start work-experience program. Contacted 33 youths, registered 20 in classes.

Providence, R.I.: Counselors studied cumulative records to identify potential dropouts; from select list of most-likely-to-drop-out students, contacts were made to encourage remaining in school. Program and scheduling changes made, financial help referrals made. Needs revealed for thorough curriculum study. Contacted 252 youths, registered 235 in classes.

Richmond, Va.: Contact with and counseling of dropouts of 1962–63 as identified in list prepared for recent State-wide study. Program and scheduling changes made, tutorial help provided. Strengthening extracurricular activities, improving guidance procedures. Plans to identify and work with potential dropouts and to thoroughly evaluate curriculum. Contacted 493 youths, registered 158 in classes.

St, Louis, Mo.: Thorough review of records to identify potential dropouts. Counselor contact with actual and potential dropouts, individualized attention given to student needs. Followups planned and further study of adaptations schools can make to improve holding power. Close cooperation with community agencies. Contacted 4,859 youths, registered 4,095 in classes.

San Antonio, Tex.: Contact of actual and potential dropouts. Some special scheduling arrangements, but no curricular changes due to lack of planning time. Support of community agencies. Contacted 796 youths, registered 182 in classes.

San Diego, Calif.: Study of school leavers to determine extent of dropout problem; early accounting of summer dropouts. Counseling emphasis in personal contact with students; study made of dropout reasons. Cooperation with community agencies. Contacted 1,692 youths, registered 1,426 in classes.

San Francisco, Calif.: Extensive publicity campaign. Contact with recent dropouts at home, counseling emphasis; early accounting of summer dropouts. (NOTE: Report noted that this school system had in effect procedures for identification of potential dropouts; curriculum studies under way and plans for curriculum revisions; work-experience programs, adult classes; experience in cooperation with community agencies. Many school-community projects are under way for improving conditions which contribute to school dropout, including projects supported by Ford Foundation grant, Manpower Development and Training Act, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's Committee on Youth, Youth Opportunity Centers.) Contacted 969 youths, registered 657 for classes.

Seattle, Wash.: Identification and contact of recent and potential dropouts. Counselors invited youths to school for guidance interviews. Schools made scheduling adjustments, launched new pre-vocational classes. Plans include followup and evaluation of crash campaign, pilot study with Washington State Employment Security Department in counseling and testing dropouts and potential dropouts, evaluation of experimental programs in food services and data processing, operation and expansion of new Occupational Guidance Centers of district, and continuation of work-experience programs. Contacted 1,732 youths, registered 1,271 in classes.

Sidney, Ohio: Preregistration survey to account for summer dropouts, contact to return to school. Needs found for work-study program for potential dropouts. Contacted 27 youths, registered 6 in classes.

Sussex, N.J.: Study of pupil mobility to determine range of dropout problem locally. Follow-up contacts with dropouts. Need shown for vocational school in area. Contacted 35 youths, registered 15 in classes.

Trenton, N.J.: Activity undertaken as part of planned study to determine nature and scope of local dropout problem. Extensive publicity. Conferences arranged with dropouts; some followup planned. School examined curriculum and made some revision in offerings to better meet the needs of nonacademic minded students. Report noted that area has cultural enrichment programs. Contacted 214 youths, registered 92 in classes.

Urbana, Ill.: Extensive publicity. Contact by counselors with recent dropouts and probable summer dropouts; reasons found for dropout. School made scheduling changes and improved counseling efforts. Plans to make thorough study of dropout problem and curriculum adaptations to meet the needs of special students. School had under way various dropout preventive measures. Contacted 41 youths, registered 21 in classes.

Washington, D.C.: Study of dropout situation. Provision of counseling services for actual and potential dropouts with aim of returning as many as possible to school; identifying problems faced by early school leavers, and discovering characteristics common in these students. Plans to continue survey. Contacted 1,512 youths, registered 1,077 in classes.

Yonkers, N.Y.: Intensive study of current dropout situation, emphasis on reasons for leaving. Complete counseling services for dropouts during period of campaign. Needs uncovered for evening programs, so immediate arrangements were made to implement through expansion of adult program. Special scheduling arrangements made for many returnees; attempts made to care for employment and welfare needs. Contacted 329 youths, registered 192 in classes.

Youngstown, Ohio: Identification of potential dropouts from school records; criteria from recent local dropout study. Followup of students whose prospects appeared best for satisfactory school achievement; guidance procedures coordinated with activities of community agencies. Compiled list of dropout reasons. School plans intensive curriculum study to determine how to best meet needs of potential dropouts. Extensive publicity. Contacted 102 youths, registered 91 in classes.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1964 O—720-630